Exhibit B

STATE OF RHODE ISLA	AND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS
PROVIDENCE, Sc.	SUPERIOR COURT
STATE OF RHODE ISLAND)
VS.) P1-1991-1941A
RAYMOND D. TEMPEST)

HEARD BEFORE

THE HONORABLE JUSTICE ROBERT D. KRAUSE ON DECEMBER 18, 2017

APPEARANCES:

> ELLEN MCNAMARA, RPR COURT REPORTER

CERTIFICATION

I, **ELLEN McNAMARA**, hereby certify that the succeeding pages 1 through 23, inclusive, are a true and accurate transcript of my stenographic notes.

*McNamara*ELLEN McNAMARA, RPR
Court Reporter

1 Monday, December 18, 2017 2 MORNING SESSION 3 THE CLERK: The matter before the Court is State of 4 Rhode Island versus Raymond Tempest, P1-1991-1941A. 5 Counsel, please identify yourselves for the record. 6 MR. YOUNGS: Patrick Youngs, for the State of Rhode 7 Island. 8 MR. BUSH: Christopher Bush, for the State. 9 MS. McCONAGHY: Jeanine McConaghy, for the State. 10 MR. KENDALL: Good morning, Your Honor. 11 For the defendant, Raymond Tempest, Mike Kendall, 12 Kate Dyson and Matt Turnell, Lauren Jones, Betty Anne 13 Waters, and John MacDonald. 14 THE CLERK: Mr. Tempest, please stand and raise your 15 right hand. 16 RAYMOND DENNIS TEMPEST, JR., 17 called as a witness, being duly sworn, testified as 18 follows: 19 THE CLERK: Please state your name and date of 20 birth. 21 THE DEFENDANT: Raymond Dennis Tempest, Jr., 22 1-28-53. 23 THE CLERK: Thank you. This matter is ready for 24 disposition. 25 THE COURT: The matter will proceed this morning by

way of what is known as an <u>Alford</u> plea. I do not see any members of the media here, perhaps they are, but in any event, cameras will not be permitted. If anybody has a cell phone and attempts to take a picture by any means, that device will be confiscated.

Mr. Tempest has heretofore pled not guilty to the murder charge in this case, and he maintains his innocence. He will, however, this morning offer what is known as an Alford plea.

An <u>Alford</u> plea is in accordance with the United States Supreme Court case of <u>North Carolina v. Alford</u> in 1970, which has been referred to on many occasions by our Supreme Court, including <u>Mattatall v. State</u>, 947 A.2d 896, 905 (2008).

An <u>Alford</u> plea -- and I go over this with you,
Mr. Tempest, because I want the record very clear that
you understand exactly what you are doing this morning.

The <u>Alford</u> plea is a procedure under which a person charged with a criminal offense may, in essence, assent to be found guilty even though he maintains his innocence, as long as the State presents a factual basis for conviction through evidence other than the defendant's own admission.

In other words, if you enter an <u>Alford</u> plea, which is accepted by this Court, that plea effectively

1 constitutes a conviction regardless of the fact that you 2. maintain your innocence. 3 Do you understand that? 4 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 5 So under the Alford plea process, THE COURT: 6 although you are relieved of having to expressly admit that you are guilty of the crime of second-degree murder, 8 notwithstanding that you have maintained your innocence, the result is that you will under the law stand convicted 10 of that crime. 11 Do you understand that? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 13 THE COURT: Do you accept that? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 15 THE COURT: Do you agree to that? 16 Yes, I do. THE DEFENDANT: 17 THE COURT: Although you are not admitting that you 18 are committing the offense under the Alford plea 19 doctrine, you are acknowledging that there is evidence in 20 this case, which if considered by a jury would be 21 sufficient to support a finding of your quilt beyond a 2.2 reasonable doubt. 23 Do you understand and accept that? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 25 THE COURT: I have a plea form before me which

1	indicates that if you are adjudged if adjudged guilty
2	under the <u>Alford</u> plea process, the sentence anticipated
3	is time served; that is to say, 23 years, seven months at
4	the ACI.
5	Is that your understanding?
6	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
7	THE COURT: The sheriff is going to show you this
8	plea form. Take a look at that plea form and tell me if
9	that's your signature on it.
10	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Mr. Kendall, is that your signature or
12	one of your co-counsel's?
13	MR. KENDALL: It's Mr. MacDonald's, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Mr. MacDonald, did you sign that
15	document?
16	MR. MACDONALD: I did, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Thank you.
18	How old are you, Mr. Tempest?
19	THE DEFENDANT: Sixty-four.
20	THE COURT: How far did you go in school?
21	THE DEFENDANT: Ninth grade.
22	THE COURT: Have you had any drugs or alcohol or
23	medication in the last 24 hours?
24	THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
25	THE COURT: Are you satisfied with all of the

1 lawyers who have represented you in this case? 2. THE DEFENDANT: Absolutely. 3 THE COURT: I'm obliged to tell you this, although I 4 don't think the admonitions apply, that if you are not a 5 United States citizen, a conviction such as this will 6 surely get you deported from this country, you'll be 7 excluded from the country, you'll be denied reentry to 8 it, and you'll be denied a request to become a 9 naturalized citizen. 10 Mr. Kendall and Mr. MacDonald, I have a belief that 11 those consequences will not befall your client, but 12 nonetheless, I take it you have discussed those kinds of 13 consequences with him? 14 MR. KENDALL: You're correct, it would not apply, 15 Your Honor, but we have fully discussed all of the issues 16 that are necessary. 17 THE COURT: You understand, Mr. Tempest, that you 18 have an absolute right to trial on the charge. You would 19 have been presumed innocent. 20 You would not have had to testify or present 21 evidence. 22 And the State would have been required to prove your 23 quilt beyond a reasonable doubt. 24 And you would have had the right to confront and

25

cross-examine witnesses.

1 And, if convicted, as you well know, could have 2. appealed your conviction to the Supreme Court. 3 If your plea is accepted, all of your trial rights 4 and your appellate rights are waived; they disappear. 5 Do you understand that? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 7 THE COURT: Once this process has been concluded, 8 you give up any right to withdraw the Alford plea without 9 permission of the Court. 10 Do you understand that as well? 11 I do, Your Honor. THE DEFENDANT: 12 THE COURT: Has anybody forced you or coerced you to 13 go through this Alford plea process? 14 THE DEFENDANT: No, they haven't. 15 THE COURT: Mr. Kendall, Mr. MacDonald, can you 16 confirm for the Court that your client fully understands 17 the import and significance of the proceedings this 18 morning and the nature of the so-called Alford plea? 19 MR. KENDALL: Yes, I confirm that, Your Honor. 20 I confirm that, Your Honor. MR. MACDONALD: 21 THE COURT: Do you have any questions about the 22 process? 23 MR. KENDALL: No, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Mr. Tempest? 25 THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

1 THE COURT: Mr. MacDonald? 2. MR. MACDONALD: No, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: All right. You can be seated. 4 I take it, Mr. Youngs, you desire to present to the 5 Court an individual who will make an impact statement and 6 then you may have some comments of your own to make? MR. YOUNGS: Yes, Your Honor. My comments will be 8 the factual proffer. Would you like the impact statement first? 10 THE COURT: I would like the impact statement first. 11 MR. YOUNGS: It's Doreen Picard's sister Christine. 12 Good morning. THE COURT: 13 THE DEFENDANT: Judge Krause and members of the 14 Court, thank you for the opportunity to speak today. 15 content I read is conveyed on behalf of Ron and Simone 16 Picard, my mom and dad. 17 Let's start with the fact that Doreen's actions on 18 that fateful day, February 19, 1982, demonstrate the kind 19 of person she was. She was selfless, always trying to do 20 the right thing, was strong-willed and confident. Let's 21 also recognize that Christmas is less than a week away. 2.2. Our faith is central in our lives and midnight mass was a 23 family tradition. Our Memere Robidoux always made sure 24 Doreen, Michael, Ronnie, me and all of our cousins were

outfitted in matching pajamas, to our dismay. Our home

25

2.

filled with laughter, joy, and food deep-rooted in French tradition.

On October 22, 1959, Ron and Simone had their first child, Doreen. She was a precious gift from God. So many photos and Super 8 films memorialize the joy-filled times they shared. Doreen was truly a miracle. No matter how many years pass, Doreen remains their little girl, beloved sister, cousin, grandchild, and niece. We each have a relationship characterized by something that is uniquely Doreen. To my brother Michael, she is forever a best friend. To Ronnie, a fun, big sister. On February 14th, 1982, she found a way to leave a Valentine heart in his car. Ronnie can never say thank you because he only learned it was from her after she died.

Doreen was my hero. She was the best big sister who shared secrets and taught me how to play sports. I remember driving to Rhode Island beaches with all the windows rolled down, singing at the top of our voices. There are so many memories that I could stand here for many days sharing her light and love-filled life.

The joy we experienced would have to last a lifetime because her life was interrupted when the Sixth Amendment, you shall not murder, was violated. The killing of Doreen was barbaric, savage and senseless. Her last moments on earth must have been filled with the

2.

antithesis of joy. Not only was she bludgeoned to death, but she was also strangled with her own sweater. There was barely any blood that remained in her lifeless body because every last beat of her heart pumped and emptied her life's blood in the basement of 409 Providence

Street. The overarching situation about this tragedy is the fact that she had barely anything at 409 Providence

Street. Most of her things were in a new apartment that she was moving into on February 20th, 1982.

It took cowardice and blatant disregard for life when a pipe was repeatedly used on the head of a woman weighing approximately 120 pounds. Make no mistake, while we are within the Court of man today, this blatant disregard for human life is not only judged by man, it is ultimately judged by our God. It is He who determines the eternal disposition of the soul. The committed act represents pure evil. However, this savage, brutal and inhuman circumstance cannot and will never extinguish Doreen's light.

Doreen continues to live in the hearts and minds of those she touched. To our children, she's a hero. An aunt that they know as an angel. Her heroic actions give us integrity and strength. She is dearly remembered as being brave enough to do something when a child was left in the hallway. A woman who took a risk and halted the

2.

savage beating of Susan Laferte. Doreen was the personification of God's love because, "Greater love has no one than this, than to lay down one's life for his friends." We stand here today knowing she paid the ultimate sacrifice of her life to save another.

In late February of 1982, Doreen was busy preparing to move. She was also planning a family dinner at her new apartment. She intended to share that she had recently finished school for her childhood education. You see, she kept her commitment to finish. She seemed so excited to surprise mom and dad.

On February 18, the night before she died, we spoke for a long time. I was on the downstairs telephone and mom on the upstairs phone. The three of us talked about curtains and how we had to bring Memere's folding chairs and extra plates. We giggled as plans were made. Little did I know that she would never be able to share the surprise with mom and dad or it was the last time we'd hear her voice.

The next day, February 19, snow lightly covered the ground. Mom and dad came in the house with groceries and the phone rang, a woman's frantic voice urged them to go to the Woonsocket police station. Something bad happened to Doreen. We'll never forget the images shown on TV of Doreen in a body bag being placed into an ambulance.

2.

2.2

I cannot even imagine what it was like for mom and dad to have to identify the lifeless body of their little girl, and subsequently to have to go to 409 Providence Street, not to move the last pieces of furniture from the apartment, but to get clothing, the garments she would be buried in. The surreal and hollow place deep within, and void in our hearts is unfillable.

For parents to have to bury a child is unthinkable; under these circumstances horrific. We made preparations at the funeral home. I recall the discoloration of her face, uncharacteristic bright lipstick, and Mimsy Fournier apologizing for the thick makeup masking Doreen's brutally beaten figure. Her head had to be pieced together, her hair arranged to shroud the devastation. Dad pulled me away as I hugged my big sister. Before I let go, I felt the raised stitching from the Y-incision. Could this really be her? Who was this person in her prom gown, with her delicate crystal rosary rested gently on her hands?

Within days we would see her casket lowered into the vault. We buried her. The numbness of that experience will never leave us. These events altered our lives and those around us from those moments, now, and forever.

In the years that passed, Ron and Simone remained deeply rooted in their faith, but also had reasons to

fear for our safety. We often received calls with veiled threats. Our phones had tape-recorders and an attachment for the receiver. Every time we picked up the phone, we were to press record. One example is the call where the voice on the other end stated that my dad's business was on fire. I remember sitting in the parking lot with Dad in his Jeep for hours during the night watching his business. To be on guard was the norm for us. Another example is the threat on my life. I'll never forget that late night when my college dean and campus police came to my dorm room to verify I was there and not harmed.

No matter what proceedings occur today, in a way, nothing changes. She didn't have the opportunity to be at our weddings, at the birth of our children, to see them laugh and re-tell stories of our youth. Our mom and dad were robbed of seeing her children, to see if they were as spirited as Doreen. She was loving and caring, an accomplished high school varsity athlete, captain, two-time MVP in volleyball and basketball, and prom queen. Many still stop my parents to share a fun fact and cherished memory of her.

Today I look across the courtroom and see our heroes, a man and a woman married for 58 years, 35 of which fighting for justice in the memory of their first born. The intimidation, constant threats, and hardships

2.

might have discouraged average people. Ron and Simone are fearless, loving and strong. Endless hours, conversations, letters, court dates, and appearances before parole boards is not what they envisioned for our family life. Nor did we plan to attend court for the trial during the same time we made final preparations for my wedding. Every experience reopens the wounds and interrupts healing. They and we do not stop because Doreen would do the same for each one of us.

Please remember Doreen and the words composed by the poet Mary Elizabeth Frye to express life and death:

Do not stand at my grave and weep. I am not there. I do not sleep. I am a thousand winds that blow. I am the diamond glints on the snow. I am the sunlight on ripened grain. I am the gentle Autumn rain. When you awaken in the morning's hush, I am the swift uplifting rush of quiet birds in circled flight. I am the soft stars that shine at night. Do not stand at my grave and cry; I am not there. I did not die.

As I approach the end of this document, we would be remiss by not mentioning the devastating injuries Susan had to deal with. We truly thank God that she survived to raise her beautiful daughters. The pursuit of justice and truth is nothing short of inspirational, a reminder of the good in humanity. In grief we have been

2.

surrounded by many who fight for Doreen and for our family.

We'd like to thank those deceased and still living. In particular, the members of the Court, Ron Pennigton, Jim O'Neill, Jeffrey Pine, Jim Ryan, Terrence Donnelly, Francis Lanctot, Rodney Remblad, John Dionne, Alphonse Auclair, Roger Remillard, Doug Connell, Patrick Youngs, Jean McConaghy, Chris Bush, Ana Giron, Peter Kilmartin, and so many others who have persevered to justice. We are eternally grateful for your dedication, time, and love.

Last, but not least, thank you mom and dad. Without your tenacity, deep faith, and endless pursuit of justice, we would not be here today. Doreen is with God now and forever smiles upon you and dwells within our hearts. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.

Mr. Kendall and Mr. MacDonald, the <u>Alford</u> plea process anticipates that the State will present to the Court a proffer, without objection from the defense, which the Court should consider in making its determination.

I take it you are onboard with that?

MR. KENDALL: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Youngs.

MR. YOUNGS: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I will tell counsel that I have been given a copy of the proffer that Mr. Youngs is about to read into the record. I have reviewed it a number of occasions, and I have thoroughly digested it and am fully familiar with its contents.

Proceed.

2.

2.2

MR. YOUNGS: Thank you.

Your Honor, had this case proceeded to trial, the State would have presented evidence, much as it did in the first trial over 25 years ago, which resulted in the defendant's conviction to second-degree murder, that at about 3:00 p.m. on February 19, 1982, 22-year-old Doreen Picard was beaten to death with a steel pipe in the basement of 409 Providence Street, where she lived in the third-floor apartment. The cause of Ms. Picard's death was blunt-force trauma, and the manner was homicide.

Also badly beaten, but not killed, was Ms. Picard's landlord, Susan Laferte, who lived in the first-floor apartment at 490 Providence Street. Due to her significant brain injuries, Ms. Laferte has no memory, not only of February 19th, 1982, but also the months before and after she was attacked. The crime scene suggests that Ms. Picard likely walked in on the beating of Ms. Laferte as she went to do her laundry in the

2.

basement, and probably saved Ms. Laferte's life, while losing her own.

The defendant, Raymond D. Tempest, Jr., had known and was friendly with Ms. Laferte for several years prior to February 19, 1982. In addition, both the defendant and Ms. Laferte owned pit bulls that, at some point prior to February 19, they mated. The defendant owned the male dog and Ms. Laferte the female. In exchange for providing the male, the defendant was promised the pick of the expected litter. The defendant, in turn, promised that pick to John Allard, the boyfriend of the defendant's wife's sister.

On February 19, at approximately 1:00 p.m., the defendant and John Allard drove from Allard's apartment to 409 Providence Street, went into the basement where the puppies were kept. Allard selected the puppy that he wanted, and he and the defendant left a short time later with that puppy.

A couple of hours later, at approximately 3:30 p.m., Douglas Heath, who lived in the second-floor apartment of 409 Providence Street, came home from work and made the horrific discovery in the basement of the two badly beaten women.

There is no inculpatory or exculpatory physical evidence in this case, either from the crime scene in the

2.

basement of 409 Providence Street or the murder weapon, a steel pipe that the police recovered four days after Doreen Picard's murder in the front hallway at 409 Providence Street. The lack of physical evidence in the basement may be attributable to, among other things, the fact that numerous police officers and rescue personnel descended upon the basement on February 19th, in an effort to save the lives of the two women.

The murder weapon, a steel pipe, was found leaning against the wall in the front hall of 409 Providence

Street by the defendant's brother Gordon Tempest, a

Woonsocket detective, four days after the murder.

Although officers had searched that hallway shortly after

Ms. Picard's murder, and one police officer would have

testified to seeing the pipe at that time and that it

appeared to him then that the pipe was covered in what he

thought was rust, it was not seized because at that time

the police did not believe that Ms. Picard and

Ms. Laferte had been attacked with a pipe. By the time

the pipe was seized four days after the murder, it had

been wiped clean.

As the investigation by the Woonsocket Police

Department proceeded, the defendant was asked four times within the first few weeks after the murder to give a statement. The statements given by the defendant, the

2.

2.2

first one, on the evening of February 19th, to his brother, the Woonsocket detective, were inconsistent and the defendant, when finally asked in the last two interviews, he never explained where he was at the time of the murder.

The crime went unsolved for close to a decade.

During that time two Woonsocket detectives, Pennington and Connell, continued to work the case and they found a number of witnesses who implicated the defendant in Miss Picard's murder.

Matthew Mandeville: At around about 2:30 in the afternoon of February 19th, Mr. Mandeville saw the defendant near Sylvia's Cafe in Woonsocket in a maroon car that the defendant's brother-in-law, Robert Monteiro, was driving.

Lisa Wells Ladue: Ms. Ladue was 15 at the time of the murder and lived in the second-floor apartment at 409 Providence Street with her mother and stepfather, Douglas Heath. Ms. Ladue arrived home at about 3:20 that afternoon and saw a maroon car parked behind the house. When the rescue arrived, the maroon car was gone.

Sheri Richards: Ms. Richards was John Allard's girlfriend and saw the defendant standing next to a maroon car talking to Robert Monteiro outside her apartment at about 4:30 or 4:45 on February 19th. The

2.

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

defendant was wearing different boots than she had seen him in earlier in the day. Ms. Richards also described the defendant's attempts to have her and Allard create a false alibi for him for the time of the murder.

Terrence Gelinas: Mr. Gelinas has known the defendant for most of his life. Mr. Gelinas lived on Providence Street in February of 1982 and was standing outside about a block away from 409 Providence Street at the time of the murder. A couple of days after Ms. Picard's murder, Gelinas gave a statement to the Woonsocket Police Department, and when he was dropped off outside his residence on Providence Street, he found the defendant waiting for him. When Gelinas went to speak with the defendant, the defendant stated, "I want you to tell me the truth. Did you see me leave?" The defendant went on to explain that he was at 409 Providence Street on the afternoon of the murder, but left right before the The defendant was emotional and said that he was afraid that the police would think that he committed the A year or so later, the defendant was talking to Gelinas about Susan Laferte. He said that he, the defendant, should not have been tapping her. In the next decade the defendant on a few occasions threatened Gelinas to stay out of this or tried to get Gelinas to change what he had told the police that the defendant had said to him on earlier occasions.

2.

2.2

John Guarino: He lived in the same apartment building as the defendant in 1983. One night he went to a club with the defendant and asked him about the murder. The defendant described how he beat both women. A few weeks later, the defendant went to Guarino's apartment and told him that he better keep his mouth shut and claimed the police had no proof.

Loretta Rivard: During the winter of 1987,

Ms. Rivard was in a bar in Blackstone, Massachusetts

where she saw the defendant. At the time, she knew of

him but had never spoken to him. After spending time

together at the bar, they drove to Ms. Rivard's

residence, where the defendant stated, "The girl that was

killed on Providence Street, yeah, well, I did it."

Ronald Vaz: Mr. Vaz lives on a farm in Burrillville and was friendly with the defendant in the 1980s. He saw the defendant in Woonsocket two days after the murder and the defendant told him that he was in trouble, that they would get him for this one and that even his father would not be able to get him out of this one. The defendant also made several visits to Mr. Vaz's farm in Burrillville, where he used cocaine. During those visits the defendant described his relationship with Ms. Laferte and said that on February 19th, 1982, he and Ms. Laferte

2.

2.2

had an argument about the puppies and their relationship, during which Ms. Laferte hit him and the defendant hit her back.

Except for Mr. Mandeville, each of those witnesses testified in the defendant's 1992 trial. Mr. Mandeville testified in the perjury trial for Gordon Tempest. The State would have presented the transcripts of the deceased Richards and Guarino, and expected the other witnesses to testify consistent with the earlier testimonies, the transcripts of which the State included in the trial binders that it submitted to the Court in July.

Since the last trial, the State met with Charles Voyer, who was driving on Providence Street on February 19th, 1982, and saw a man he has identified as the defendant, walking on Providence Street with a red substance splattered on him. This was shortly before he noticed the police at 409 Providence Street.

In addition to these witnesses, and consistent with the 1992 trial, the State would've introduced testimony from numerous witnesses who have testified about the handling of the crime scene and the evidence, the circumstances of the installation of locks at 409 Providence Street the day after the murder, and the flow of the lengthy investigation, including the impediments

to it.

2.

2.2

The State would've also called the medical examiner to testify about the cause and manner of Ms. Picard's death. An expert in trace evidence analysis would have testified as he did at the 2015 post-conviction relief hearing, that none of the 36 hairs found in Ms. Picard's hands after her death contained roots, but rather were either broken or cut and that, as such, it is unlikely the hairs were pulled from someone else's head.

At the end of the presentation, the State would have proven the defendant's guilt to murder in the second degree beyond a reasonable doubt, just as it did in 1992.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Youngs.

As I said at the outset of Mr. Young's comments, I am thoroughly familiar with the proffer that he has just read into the record. I'm also familiar and have reviewed the transcripts that Mr. Youngs has referred to, and I am more than satisfied that there is ample evidence beyond peradventure that the proffer that Mr. Youngs makes would be sufficient to find the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt of the charge of second-degree murder.

I take it counsel for the defendant has no further information or comments to offer and that all that is

left is to invite the defendant, should he be interested, to exercise his right of allocution. Mr. Tempest, you have an opportunity, should you choose to exercise it, to make any statement you care for the record. Do you wish to do that? MR. KENDALL: No, Your Honor. THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: Very well. The sentence will therefore be imposed as earlier indicated upon the record and in the plea form: Time served, 23 years and seven months. We are adjourned. (Proceedings adjourned at 10:11 a.m.)